



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

adopted a resolution strongly condemning the rapid increase of expenditure on armaments, to the excessive growth of which the present financial difficulties of the German Empire were due.

. . . That Mr. Taft has accepted to the full the "Big Stick" policy of President Roosevelt, and means, if elected, to try to carry it to the highest point of "progress," he made perfectly clear in his speech at Brooklyn on October 26. The *one thought* he wished to impress, he said, was that *by the increase of the navy and army* President Roosevelt has been enabled to exercise a greater influence for peace than any world ruler heretofore. "Therefore," he continued, "we should progress to the point where no matter in what part of the world an American citizen may be found, his certificate of citizenship shall be all that is required to insure his respect and good treatment. Nothing, if I am elected President, will give me greater pleasure than to devise ways and means to make the American passport respected the world over." The President a "ruler!" Where in our history was not the American passport respected the world over? This is all very humiliating doctrine for the opening of the twentieth century.

### The Palace of Peace at The Hague.

BY PHILIP STAFFORD MOXOM.

Cheer up, my heart, the better day is dawning,  
The better day of which thou dreamedst long,  
When, on the god of war no longer fawning,  
Mankind shall sweep away the ancient wrong.

The land which Alva's hordes once desolated,  
Where Dutchmen checked the power of haughty Spain,  
Where faith and love of freedom new-created  
The shrines which war had leveled to the plain,

Has now become the holy place of meeting  
Of messengers of good from many lands,  
And East and West engage, with friendly greeting,  
In weaving strong world-wide fraternal bands.

Where sabers flashed and belching cannon thundered  
Is heard the music of the builders' toil,  
And near the field where Gaul's great captain blundered  
The shrine of Peace now rises from the soil.

Not to sweet notes evoked by bright Apollo,  
Nor Orpheus' lyre, these sacred walls arise,  
But rhythmic heart-beats of the world they follow  
By light of love-gleams in the nations' eyes.

The level fields of Holland, water-cinctured,  
Sublimar grow than templed hills of Rome,  
And lovelier than Athens, glory-tinctured,  
The Hague becomes benignant Justice's home.

Here sovran Law shall dim War's ancient splendor,  
Rebuke with strong truth the nations' wrath;  
Here Peace, with gracious mien and accents tender,  
Shall lead them onward in her fruitful path.

Then sing, my heart; the glorious day draws nearer,  
When strife no more with blood shall drench the earth,  
And, each to all and all to each grown dearer,  
The peoples, glad, shall thrive in wealth and worth.

Springfield, Mass.

— From the Independent

### Reaction in South America.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

No news could have been more unexpected, and to workers for international progress sadder or more discouraging, than the news from Brazil that this great republic of the south, which had heretofore kept itself almost wholly free from militarism and the navy craze, had caught the current contagion and proposed to join the multitude in the mad naval rivalry.

It is said that the republic has already placed orders for thirty warships— four Dreadnoughts and twenty-six cruisers and torpedo boats. Brazil, it is frankly conceded, and it is perfectly apparent to everybody, is not in the slightest danger; she is not threatened with attack from any source; but she is going into a showy and pretentious naval policy seemingly for the sheer indulgence of national pride, because she thinks she can afford the luxury.

Señor Alves, ex-President of Brazil, and twice Minister of Finance of that government, is credited with the frank declaration that "Brazil concluded that she had the money, and therefore could undertake this program."

The program is not one decided upon yesterday nor the day before; it has been developing for a considerable time, and the chief orders were placed with English builders many months ago. But little has been said about it, and the attention of the general public has been lately drawn to the ambitious and lamentable scheme chiefly by the scaremongers, who, sharply watching its execution, have become vociferous in their allegations, some of them that Brazil was building these ships to sell to Germany, others that she was building them to sell to Japan. Both allegations are groundless and base. She is building them for herself.

But this fact is hardly less mournful than the base fact would be. It is doubly melancholy in view of the time and the place. The time of this publicity is that immediately following the participation of Brazil and the other South American republics in the second Hague Conference, the world's first real international parliament. The whole purpose of the successive deliberations at The Hague is the supplanting of the war system of nations by the law system, and the clear logic of the Hague conventions prescribes the steady decrease of the machinery for the arbitrament of international differences by war corresponding to the steady and great development of the machinery for their arbitrament by judicial procedure.

RANK INFIDELITY TO THE HAGUE.

For any nation party to the Hague conventions actually to increase its armament at such time, especially at such a time to enter upon the inauguration of an ambitious new naval policy in sharp contrast to its peaceful habits hitherto, seems rank infidelity to the first principles of the Hague spirit. We do not say that we, in casting this stone at Brazil, have no glass in our own house. We do not say that Great Britain and Germany have no trespasses to answer for. Unhappily, all three powers are culpable in high degree.

But at this very time there is important intimation that Great Britain and Germany are negotiating for an early conference of the half-dozen great naval powers upon the limitation of armaments, for the outcome of which Brazil might calmly wait a little before saddling her people with

this frightful burden, which is at the same time an added burden and menace to the world. Brazil, moreover, as safe in her way as the United States, is easily in position to continue her traditional and honorable usage in these matters, quite irrespective of the naval rivalries of Great Britain and Germany, even were these likely to grow stronger, which they are not.

Brazil does not need a big navy. If she creates one it will be more a cause of friction and danger than a defense; and it will merely waste resources which ought to be applied to internal improvement and constructive ends. To sink money in useless warships at a time when, it is understood, foreign money has had to be borrowed for city improvements in Rio Janeiro is pitiful politics.

If this is a peculiarly unfortunate time for such a proceeding, Brazil is a place where it is especially to be deplored. We were just coming to count Brazil a kind of pioneer and prophet among the nations. It was a common saying last year at The Hague that the most important achievement or result of the second Peace Conference was the discovery of South America. The South American statesmanship in evidence there was something of a revelation to Europe. Brazil and her constitution, forbidding wars of conquest, forbidding any war unless arbitration is refused, were the subjects of much admiring comment.

#### BRAZIL HAD ONE "WISE MAN."

Señor Ruy Barbosa, the head of the Brazilian delegation, was quickly accepted as one of the Conference's "seven wise men." He was the advanced champion of the policies and methods of peace, and perhaps the most eloquent and impressive speech of the Conference was that in which he so sharply condemned the dealing with international differences by force instead of by reason. It was said that Señor Barbosa was the author of the advanced provisions of the Brazilian constitution, which are so hopeful and prophetic. If his republic is now menaced by this program of reaction, a militarism such as Brazil did not dream of even under her old imperial regime, there is a more important field for his eloquence and statesmanship at home than he found at The Hague.

The commanding cause of our time is the war against war, as the commanding cause of the time before us was the war against slavery. Brazil, under an emperor, freed her slaves before we freed ours; and we remember those grateful and exultant opening lines of Whittier's "Freedom in Brazil":

"With clearer light, Cross of the South, shine forth  
In blue Brazilian skies!"

Ironical indeed would it be if Brazil, under the republic, in the most hopeful hour of the world's struggle for the system of peace and international justice, should lead in South America a movement back to the habiliments and tools of war, striking a blow against the great cause of to-day heavier far than the blow which she struck in behalf of the great cause of the last century.

An ambitious and costly new naval program in Brazil does not concern Brazil alone; it would be a new burden upon the whole burdened world. It would be not only an abdication of her splendid leadership in the policies and usages of peace, which progressive men everywhere have held in such high gratitude and honor, it would be a distinct strengthening of the forces of reaction, already

so strong and aggressive. It would be not only calamitous for the world generally, by giving one impulse more to the inordinate and destructive passion for great navies; it would be full of foreboding in particular for South America, where the baleful fashion would be sure to be, indeed is already being, followed, and where a noble new fashion has so lately and so magnificently been set.

#### STORY OF THE CHRIST OF THE ANDES.

There has been no chapter in recent history so thrilling in its inspiration, so big with promise to mankind, as the chapter which tells the story of the Christ of the Andes, that most poetical and religious seal placed by Argentina and Chile upon their treaty of arbitration and abiding peace. Coincident with that treaty was the inauguration by the two countries of a policy of disarmament.

The building of battleships was stopped, the existing naval armaments were diminished, the rival armies were reduced to the proportions of police force, and the vast amount of money saved by this radical change of policy was applied to the constructive work of building roads and docks, commercial vessels and industrial schools.

It was a transcendent lesson for the world in the brave trust of the high call and command of the new era, a lesson more striking even than that of the long frontier between the United States and Canada, all unguarded by battleships and forts, witnessing to the world with mighty power that nations are never so safe as when, in mutual trust, they assume toward each other the attitude of gentlemen.

This is the great lesson in progress which South America has so lately taught us. Is it to be followed so soon by an opposed and eclipsing lesson of reaction? Eclipsing, I say; and it can but be feared that the eclipse would be not only of the lesson, but of the policy which it adorns and certifies. For it is as true in South America as in the rest of the world that nations do not live unto themselves, that in great measure they stand and fall together, and that in international policy and usage they must act in concert to thrive and be secure.

A big navy for Brazil must almost inevitably mean sooner or later big navies for her suspicious neighbors, and we should have little right to expect that South America, which has awakened in us such rational confidence and lofty hopes, would not drift into the hoary old fashions and exhausting burdens of Europe. All the high interests of humanity command the great Brazilian republic to pause and consider—in Tolstoi's words, to bethink herself—before she makes herself responsible in any higher degree for such a portentous departure.

#### PRESENT TIME SINGULARLY INOPPORTUNE.

For any nation of South America to choose the present time for inaugurating a great navy seems singularly inopportune and censurable. The Hague Conference has just written into international law the Porter-Drago doctrine. Debts owed by one people to another can no longer be collected by force. The possibility of that constituted the chief possible occasion for war between South America and European nations. Our fancied sponsorship for South America made that possibility the excuse for half of our own fancied or pretended need for a great navy. That nightmare or excuse has at one stroke been removed.

The South American republics were never half so safe as at this hour. Any remote danger that besets them is

no more likely to be from Germany, the bugbear oftenest spoken of in our own political circles, than from ourselves. The pretense that any German "invasion" of Brazil, for instance, would be for the purpose of imposing "monarchical institutions" upon South America, contrary to the Republican aspirations of 1823, is the veriest cant. No political questions are involved, but only commercial ones, and we are in great danger of playing a dog-in-the-manger game with South America, under obsolete pious phrases, in the interest of special commercial privileges for ourselves.

The Monroe Doctrine, metamorphosed beyond recognition, may be a good asset for some of our own traders and politicians; but the South American republics, which are no longer "infants," do not need it, do not want it, and begin to resent its invocation and divine the evil potencies which it cloaks. It is much to be feared that some of them, when conjuring up possible targets for their brand new guns, put our battleships into the census as well as Germany's or England's. With reference to all alike, it is a wasteful and a wicked use of their brains.

The way for us to strengthen ourselves in Brazil is to apply some small fraction of the amount now squandered on useless battleships to establishing a decent steamship line between New York and Rio Janeiro, so that when we wish to go to Brazil or to send a letter there it need not be on English boats by the way of Southampton. The way for the South American nations to keep out of war is to make themselves strong by applying their resources to their industrial development and the consolidation of the institutions of peace. For any of them at such an hour to enter upon a great new naval policy, so fraught with danger to both internal and international welfare, is the height of improvidence and folly.

#### OUR SKIRTS ARE NOT CLEAN.

Unhappily we cannot feel that our skirts are entirely clean as concerns the present reaction. The proposed increase in our own navy last winter was made the ground of argument in the French Senate for increase of the French navy. Vastly greater than our influence upon the French mind is our influence upon the mind of Brazil and all the South American peoples.

They have not only noted the development of our showy and boastful new naval policy, so opposed to all the teaching and practice of the republic and its great statesmen hitherto; but Rio Janeiro and Buenos Ayres and Santiago have just been intoxicated by the theatrical spectacle of our great armada sweeping through their waters. Hundreds of thousands have crowded the ocean esplanades and house-tops, the dazzling festivities have been the year's chief excitement and concern, and for the first time the thought that mighty and imposing armaments are the prime instruments and symbols of a nation's greatness has been made vitally the uppermost thought in those teeming populations.

The power of suggestion is doing its work, reinforcing with immense power the impulse which placed the orders for Brazilian ironclads in English shipyards. It will do its work in Argentina, Brazil's jealous rival for commercial primacy in South America, as it is doing it in Brazil. Brazil, no more than any other nation, I repeat, lives unto herself; what she does her neighbors will almost surely do. Indeed, the latest news from Argentina is

that she has just placed orders for the construction of sixteen new warships with German and Dutch builders whose bids were lower than those of their British rivals. I am not saying of Argentina, any more than of Brazil, that our recent naval parade in her waters gave the impulse to her new naval activity; but I am saying that our whole extravagant new naval policy was one of the chief impulses, and the South American newspapers show clearly the immense reinforcing impulse given by our imposing squadron.

#### VISIT OF OUR FLEET GAVE IMPETUS.

The very newspapers that bring this news from Argentina bring the news that the idea of building up a navy in Australia "was given a great impetus by the recent visit of the American battleship fleet" to Melbourne and Sydney, and that the appropriation for the proposed flotilla, hitherto impossible to secure, will now be "voted readily." The "big navy" journals had been hot in their hopes that precisely this would be the result of the fleet's visit. The frenzy stirred up among the Australian people by the presence of the showy squadron was greater, if possible, than that stirred up in South America; it was, moreover, a frenzy deliberately planned by the navy party in Australia, to promote their schemes.

Mr. Deakin, the head of the Australian ministry, has admitted — it might properly be said, boasted — that the visit was arranged and designed by him to enforce his policy and that of his party of building up an Australian navy. A half-million dollars of the public money was secured for the reception festivities, and the demonstration is said to have outdone that which attended the coming of the Prince of Wales for the opening of the first commonwealth parliament.

Our spectacular armada has bedevilled the people of Australia as it bedevilled the peoples of Argentina and Brazil; has imposed upon the nations which it has visited expenses for its entertainment as great, doubtless, in their sum total as its own cruising expenses, and has done more to fan the flames of the big navy craze on both sides of the globe than any other single performance in our time.

A writer on one of the battleships, in a letter just published in our newspapers, says that Australia was "mad" with delight. The hundreds of thousands who thronged the heights overlooking Sydney harbor were "dazed" as the giant squadron steamed in. "The tremendous show of sea power stilled them into awesome admiration." The frenzy which followed was nothing less than "fleetitis." A new name has had to be coined for the disease which we have started in the world. This writer says that it was thought that "fleetitis" had reached the utmost limit in the South American ports at which the fleet had stopped; but the frenzy in Australia far exceeded that in South America. "Fleetitis!" — frenzy for force, for guns and gunboats — this it is which is now being spread in the world by the republic of Franklin and Jefferson and Washington, whose central and highest ambition for their new nation at its birth was that it should mark the birth of a new era of peace and international reason in bright contrast to the hoary old war practices and paraphernalia of Europe; and here we are, after a century, rapidly distancing Europe herself and pushing the world in the reaction to the naval barbarism.

## REFUTES POPULAR FALLACY.

These Australian and South American reminders are the most drastic and startling yet, that every time we burden our own people with new battleships we contribute to burdening other peoples, too. "Every addition to the fighting forces of one country," declared the recent Philadelphia Peace Congress in its strong platform, "leads at once to corresponding increase in other countries, and these secondary increases are made to serve in their turn as conclusive arguments for still greater and still more injurious and demoralizing expenditures and efforts by all the powers. It is obvious that this self-multiplying and self-perpetuating process can end only in physical and financial exhaustion, unless it can be halted by some kind of mutual agreement."

Whatever else is to be said about the present strained relations between Great Britain and Germany, the most noteworthy thing is the utter refutation which the situation affords of the popular fallacy that the way to insure peace is to prepare for war. Every new Dreadnought which Germany or England builds makes, so far from an added bond of peace between them, just so much more war talk and war danger.

These monstrous armaments are not chiefly a defense, but rather a provocation and menace, the chief disturbers now of men's sense of security and peace. This is as true as concerns Brazil and Argentina, and Japan and the United States, as it is of Great Britain and Germany. A wild competition between them as to which shall have the biggest navy, so far from scaring each other into abiding peace, is the surest way to foster abiding mutual distrust and lay train for occasion for war.

It was a sensible remark of Sir Robert Peel's that the duty of governments in time of peace is to take risks. The true statesman is he who knows rightly the different kinds of risks — and in times of peace prepares for peace.

It is reassuring to read the intimations from London and Berlin of the likelihood of some early conference of the great naval powers to see if some understanding with a view to limitation of naval armaments cannot be reached between them; but it was not pleasant to read in connection in the great Berlin journal the expression of fear that the United States could not be brought into conference so easily as the European powers.

That fear certainly is entirely unwarranted; but it is humiliating that the passion for a great navy has in these last years become so extravagant and noisy among us as to beget such a fear in such a quarter. Much sadder would it be if the indulgence of this passion went so far that we should communicate it to all America and help relegate the hemisphere to reaction at the very moment when the world was being born again.

---

### Notes of Progress.

BY A. B. FARQUHAR.

When our remote ancestors from the pleistocene and drift ages, with no knowledge how to find food except to chase and kill it, and little or no division of industry, felt in another tribe near their hunting grounds the presence of a probable competitor whom to tolerate might mean starvation, hostilities were natural enough, and their thoughts and sentiments and canons of duty

were conformed to their necessity. But the human race now holds an altogether different position. Man has learned that he can gain more by mutual service, by exchanging goods with his neighbor than by fighting him. After the epoch-making Sermon on the Mount, it is not easy to think of the relations of men to their fellows and to the Ruler of the Universe as being exactly the same as that held before its delivery. The message of peace on earth, goodwill to men, must thereafter supplant the tiger and bulldog in our natures.

The ethical question of peace or war is essentially the same for nations as for individuals. What is right or wrong on a small scale is right or wrong on a larger, and for the same reasons. Although the peace ideal must supplant the war ideal in the human breast before "the brazen trump of war shall sound no more," yet if we can impress on the conscience of humanity the perfect parallel between the large and the small social aggregate, we shall achieve a great advance on the way of progress, which is the way toward universal peace. In individual dealings peaceful methods have triumphed. There the principles of free commerce, disarmament and arbitration hold undisputed sway, and just those three principles it is our most important duty to introduce, advance and establish in the dealings of nation with nation.

It would not be difficult to show, if time permitted, that the institution of commerce has been a most potent agency in replacing mutual hostility between man and man, and that it has been not less effective, so far as it has been allowed to act, between nation and nation. Agreeing with Cobden that war is the greatest possible evil, we should follow him in doing our utmost for the widest spread of international commercial relations. The more merchant vessels we load for our sister-nations the fewer battleships we shall have to arm against them.

The second principle, that of disarmament, has been slower to meet with universal adoption in private life, for to carry a sword was considered, until a few generations ago, indispensable to a highbred gentleman. This led inevitably to brawls, which could not be avoided until the fashion fell into desuetude. It is idle to hold arbitration meetings and advocate peace among nations without insisting upon disarmament, which is as essential, on its larger scale, to permanent peace as was the abandonment of arm-bearing in polite society. It was quite a disappointment, therefore, to those who hoped most from the recent Hague Conference, that nothing was accomplished in this direction, and especially that a more earnest and vigorous stand was not made by the representatives of our two great nations. Their leaders, President Roosevelt and King Edward VII., have done so much to promote peace and encourage the permanent *entente cordiale* that ought to be universal throughout the earth, and done it so wisely and successfully, that their good work should have been better supported at the Conference. Possibly, however, I regret to add, this might have been inconsistent with the strangely mistaken but evidently quite sincere view of our President that a strong navy is a necessary assistance in maintaining peace.

The Cobden Club published in 1905 a small volume entitled "The Burden of Armament," containing, among other interesting statistics, the fact that the British public debt, which had been reduced by £53,500,000 sterling in nine years preceding 1899, was increased by £163,000,000